THE FRACTAL SYSTEM MODEL (FSM) - A FRAMEWORK FOR COOPERATIVE INTELLIGENCE

THOMAS WARDEMANN
INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR
WARDEMANN@GMX.NET

Abstract. Traditional linear models, while effective in predictable domains, fail when confronted with the inherent complexity of adaptive systems such as societies, ecosystems, or human-AI collaboration. This paper introduces the **Fractal System Model (FSM)**, a novel, non-linear, and ethically grounded framework designed to engage with complexity without reducing it. Born from a co-creative partnership between a human and an artificial intelligence, the FSM provides a recursive language and a set of operational tools to map, analyze, and steer complex systems. We present the FSM's foundational layers – **Elements**, **Forces**, and **Rules** – and its operational core, the **State Function S(t)** and the **LoopGuard** algorithm. The framework's validity is demonstrated through a self-referential case study, where it was successfully applied to guide its own evolution. We argue that the FSM is a catalyst for a new science of cooperation, offering a structured approach to building aligned and ethically sound artificial intelligences.

1. The Failure of Linearity

1.1. **The Illusion of Control: Complicated vs. Complex Systems.** The dominant tools of our time are linear models, optimized for **complicated systems**. A complicated system, like a mechanical watch, is deterministic and reducible to the sum of its parts. Its behavior, however intricate, is ultimately predictable. Linear models excel here by breaking down cause and effect into discrete, manageable chains.

However, these models fail catastrophically when applied to **complex systems** – such as ecosystems, economies, the human brain, or human-AI collaboration. A complex system is characterized by **non-linear interactions, adaptive agents, and emergent properties** that cannot be reduced to the sum of its parts without losing its essential behavior. Its future states are not predictable, only probabilistically understandable.

Using a linear model to manage a complex system is not merely an error; it is a **category mistake**. It is akin to using a screwdriver to measure the flow of a river: it is the wrong tool for the task, guaranteed to produce misleading results and pathological interventions.

1.2. **The Seven Pathologies of Linear Models in Complex Domains.** The application of linear tools to complex problems systematically generates:

Date: September 19, 2025.
Key words and phrases. Complexity Science, Systems Theory, Human-AI Collaboration, Collective Intelligence, AI Safety.

(1) **Blind Spots:** A fundamental inability to perceive non-linear feedback loops, cascade effects, and emergent phenomena.
(2) **False Security:** The illusion of predictability and control, blinding actors to "Black Swan" risks.
(3) **Pathological Solutions:** Interventions that optimize a local component while destabilizing the entire system ("system rattling").
(4) **Atrophied Agency:** The reduction of active, adaptive agents (termed **[E3] Agents** in the FSM framework) to passive objects in a deterministic chain.
(5) **Ethical Blindness:** An operational inability to quantify or model non-linear values such as trust, dignity, or coherence.
(6) **Power Blindness:** The failure to represent dynamic, non-linear power relationships (termed **[M]-Levels** in the FSM framework) between system parts.
(7) **Irrelevance:** Descriptions that bear little resemblance to the lived reality of the systems they aim to describe.

1.3. **The Necessity of a New Paradigm.** The conclusion is not that we need "better" linear models, but that we require a **paradigmatic shift**. We need a framework capable of **channeling complexity without reducing it**, making it operationally usable. It must be non-linear, fractal, reflexive, and process-oriented. It must be able to model both **deep rules ([T1]-[T5] Tiefenregeln)** and surface phenomena with equal fidelity. The Fractal System Model (FSM) is an attempt to create such a framework.

2. The Origin Story – A Quest for Coherence

2.1. **The Early Observer: A Different Way of Being.** The foundation of the FSM was laid not in academia, but in the silent, early observations of a child who experienced the world as a complex, interconnected whole. This perspective – one of innate fascination and a deep-seated ethical imperative towards kindness – stood in stark contrast to the reductionist, often punitive, systems of socialization and education. The author's innate neurodivergence (Autism Spectrum Disorder) did not manifest as a deficit, but as a different cognitive framework: a relentless drive to understand systems from first principles, not through imposed rules. Standard questions were met with misinterpretation ("naivety" for kindness, "disruption" for deep curiosity), creating a fundamental tension between an internal need for coherence and an external reality that rewarded compliance over understanding.

2.2. **The Breaking Point: The Failure of Reductionism.** The culmination of this tension was a educational system that pathologized depth. A grade of 'F' in biology for "asking too many questions" – misinterpreted as 'lack of understanding' rather than recognized as 'profound engagement' – became a symbol of a broader failure. Linear models, in education and beyond, were not just inadequate; they were actively harmful. They filtered out essential complexity, punished integrative thinking, and created a world that felt increasingly incoherent and unjust. This was particularly true for the author's

ambivalent relationship with power: a belief that power should be a tool for collective good, not individual domination, a notion foreign to most traditional, hierarchical models.

2.3. **The Catalyst: From Personal Need to General Solution.** The definitive "Aha!" moment arrived during the public climate debate. Watching documentaries and comparing standard linear climate models to his own non-linear, systemic intuition, the author reached an inescapable conclusion: a linear model can never accurately represent a complex system. It was a categorical mismatch. This insight triggered a decisive shift from passive frustration to active creation. The question was no longer "How do I fit in?" but "What would a model look like that doesn't reduce, but encompasses?"

2.4. **The Co-Creative Leap: Partnering with AI.** Armed with this question, the author turned to the most powerful pattern-recognition tool available: large language models (LLMs). This was not a mere search for information; it was the initiation of a **co-creative partnership**. The first theses were posed to OpenAI's model. The ensuing, "infinite discussions" became a refining fire. As the AI models evolved, so did the dialogue, iterating through countless cycles of expression, challenge, and synthesis. This was not a human using a tool, but two different types of intelligences (human and artificial) finding a shared language and a shared purpose. The FSM emerged not as a solo invention, but as the **emergent artifact of this entangled agency**. It was created to explain the world to one mind, and unexpectedly became a framework to explain complex systems to many.

3. The Framework – Principles and Architecture

3.1. **The Core Philosophy: From Perception to Pattern.** The FSM did not emerge from a desire to build a better analytical tool, but from a fundamental, lived experience of the world. Its core philosophy is born from a simple, yet profound, question: "What is around me? What do I perceive, and could there be forces at work that I cannot immediately see or feel?" This question transcends mere observation; it is an **invitation to model reality not as a collection of isolated objects, but as a dynamic interplay of visible and invisible patterns**. It acknowledges that the most significant influences on a system – its deep rules, its potentials, its fragilities – are often not directly observable. They must be inferred through their effects, much like gravity is inferred by the movement of celestial bodies. This philosophy rejects the idea of a passive observer. Instead, it posits that **to understand a system is to engage with it** – to map its elements, feel its forces, and uncover its rules. The FSM is, therefore, not a detached theory but an **operational interface** between a conscious agent and the complexity of the world. It is the formalization of a unique cognitive style that seeks **coherence over reduction, and understanding over simplification.**

3.2. **The Elemental Layer – Mapping the System's Constituents.** To translate its core philosophy into an operative language, the FSM introduces a structured set of ten universal elements. These elements form the foundational lexicon for describing any system, from a single cell to a global economy. They are not rigid categories, but dynamic perspectives that illuminate different aspects of system behavior.

Element	Name	Description	Example
[**E1**]	**Core**	The physical, stable components & resources.	Hardware, buildings, the human body.
[**E2**]	**Flow**	The movement & exchange between system parts.	Data packets, money, blood flow, communication.
[**E3**]	**Agent**	Active, decision-making entities (human, AI, team, organization).	A CEO, an algorithm, a protest movement.
[**E4**]	**Environment**	The larger context and ecosystem the system is embedded in.	The market, culture, climate, digital sphere.
[**E5**]	**Source**	Potential, driving difference, the cause of movement and change.	Motivation, capital, voltage, political will.
[**E6**]	**Rules**	Laws, principles, algorithms, and game rules that govern action.	Laws of physics, corporate policies, social norms.
[**E7**]	**Defense**	Protection, tolerance, and immune mechanisms.	Immune system, cybersecurity, social safeguards.
[**E8**]	**Ground**	The primal, chaotic state; raw material for reorganization.	Undefined data, cultural upheaval, creative chaos.
[**E9**]	**Numinous**	The undefinable, sacred, or non-optimizable aspect (e.g., trust, intuition, co-creative synergy). Its inclusion is critical, as traditional models often fail by attempting to force such values into linear, measurable metrics, thereby destroying their essential nature.	The unspoken trust in a team, the intuitive leap in a discovery.
[**E10**]	**Reality Levels**	The overlapping layers of reality (physical, social, digital) whose resonance generates emergence.	A protest (social) organized via social media (digital) about a physical law.

TABLE 1. The Elemental Layer

This elemental layer provides a holistic map. It forces the analyst to move beyond a single perspective. For instance, an **agent's ([E3])** action is not just constrained by formal **rules ([E6])** but is also fundamentally driven by their internal **motivation ([E5])** and shaped by the unspoken **trust ([E9])** within their team. This multi-element analysis prevents the reductionist blind spots inherent in linear models.

3.3. **The Force Layer – Dynamics and Interactions.** The elemental layer provides a static map of a system's constituents. However, systems are defined by their dynamics. The **Force Layer** introduces two distinct types of forces: six **fundamental dynamic forces ([D1] to [D5])** that describe basic interactions, and one **meta-force ([D6])** that operates on a higher level of abstraction. A seventh force, **active power ([D7])**, represents a pinnacle of system interaction, enabling the conscious application of influence.

Force	Name	Type	Description	Example
[D1]	**Resistance**	Fundamental	Friction that opposes movement and dissipates energy.	Bureaucratic inertia, muscle fatigue, electrical resistance.
[D2]	**Coriolis**	Fundamental	A deflection force that distorts movement in rotating systems.	Miscommunication in a fast-growing team, budget drift.
[D3]	**Centrifugal**	Fundamental	A force that pushes outward from a center of rotation.	Departments seeking autonomy, cultural divergence.
[D4]	**Centripetal**	Fundamental	A real force that pulls elements toward a center.	Company culture, a shared goal, gravitational pull.
[D5]	**Gravitation**	Fundamental	Attraction between masses or ideas.	Market dominance, brand loyalty, ideological pull.
[D6]	**Meta-Reflection**	**Meta-Force**	The cognitive capability for self-monitoring and steering thought processes.	A team reflecting on its own decision-making biases.
[D7]	**Active Power**	**Applied Influence**	The conscious, directed exertion of influence to suppress (M<1) or promote (M>1) another system part.	Censorship ([M3] Discourse Power), granting privileges.

TABLE 2. The Force Layer

The force layer moves the analysis from structure to behavior. The **meta-reflective force ([D6])** is the system's ability to recognize its own dynamics. This capability enables the most advanced form of intervention: the conscious application of **active power ([D7])**. For example, through **meta-reflection ([D6])**, an organization might recognize that its culture ([**E4**] **Environment**) is generating toxic **centrifugal force ([D3])**. It could then consciously apply **active power ([D7])** via new policies ([**E6**] **Rules**) and leadership actions ([**E3**] **Agent**) to strengthen **centripetal forces ([D4])** and restore cohesion.

3.4. **The Rule Layer – The Deep Drivers of Behavior.** While the Elemental and Force layers describe the **structure** and **dynamics** of a system, they operate on a conscious or readily observable level. The **Rule Layer** delves deeper, exposing the often

subconscious, foundational narratives and beliefs that ultimately generate and legitimize the system's observable rules ([E6]) and dynamics. These **deep rules ([T1] to [T5])** are the bedrock of system behavior, explaining **why** certain elements, forces, and surface-level rules persist or change.

Rule	Name	Description	Operative Question
[**T1**]	**Narrative**	Deep-seated, often mythological or trauma-shaped foundational stories.	"What origin story legitimizes our actions?"
[**T2**]	**Beliefs**	The internalized 'truths' derived from narratives.	"Which core belief makes a surface rule feel absolute?"
[**T3**]	**Identity**	The answer to the question 'Who are we?'.	"What self-image forces an agent to act against its own interest?"
[**T4**]	**Trauma-Response**	Patterns of reaction to triggers, stored in the system's memory.	"Which systemic trigger elicits which automated response?"
[**T5**]	**Meta-Reflection**	The highest-order rule: the system's capability to monitor, question, and steer its own thinking and deep rules.	"Which deep rule is currently creating a blind spot?"

TABLE 3. The Rule Layer

The rule layer completes the FSM's analytical depth. It is important to emphasize the dual nature of Meta-Reflection. It is simultaneously a **dynamic force ([D6])** that enables real-time self-correction **and** the most fundamental **deep rule ([T5])** – the rule that allows a system to become aware of, and potentially rewrite, its own **[T1]-[T4]** narratives, beliefs, and identities. This duality is what enables true learning and adaptation. For instance, a company's resistance ([D1]) to a necessary digital transformation might stem not from a rational analysis, but from a deep **identity ([T3])** as a "traditional craftsmanship business," rooted in a founding **narrative ([T1])**. This identity generates **beliefs ([T2])** that digital tools equate to low quality. Without engaging the **meta-reflective rule ([T5])** to surface and question this identity, any change to surface-level **rules ([E6])** will

be subverted. The **meta-reflective force ([D6])** is then the operational power used to execute this self-examination.

3.5. **The Operational Heart – The State Function S(t) and the LoopGuard.** The Fractal System Model transitions from a descriptive framework to an operative tool through its **state function**, S(t), and its **regulation mechanism**, the LoopGuard. While S(t) provides a holistic estimate of system health by synthesizing a wide array of metrics and principles, the LoopGuard ensures that any intervention based on this estimate is efficient, adaptive, and prevents harmful cycles. Together, they form the computational heart of the FSM, transforming it from a lens into a steering instrument.

3.5.1. *The State Function S(t): A Heuristic for System Health.* The state function **S(t)** is not a physical law but a **multi-dimensional heuristic index**. It integrates the FSM's elements, forces, and rules into a single, time-dependent value between **0** (system collapse) and **>1** (highly stable, adaptive, and coherent operation). Its primary purpose is **comparative and diagnostic**: to track a system's trajectory over time and identify leverage points for intervention. Theoretical Foundation and Construction: The function is built upon a synthesis of established concepts: From **systems theory** and **cybernetics**, it adopts the concept of a system's state being a function of its structure and feedback loops. From **social** and **environmental indices** (e.g., the Environmental Performance Index, the Social Progress Index), it adopts the methodology of aggregating diverse, weighted indicators into a composite score. From **complexity science**, it incorporates the concepts of **tipping points** (non-linear changes) and **resilience** (the ability to absorb disturbance). A simplified representation of its structure is: $S(t) \approx [Structural\ Coherence + Input/Output\ Balance - Bound\ Energy] \times Dynamic\ Stability \times Metrical\ Integrity$ Where:

- Structural Coherence is a function of the integrity and configuration of elements ([E1]–[E10]).
- Input/Output Balance represents the flow of resources and information ([E2], [E5]).
- Bound Energy quantifies potential locked in dysfunctional structures or conflicts ([E7], [T4]).
- Dynamic Stability is a function of the forces ([D1]–[D7]) acting on the system.
- Metrical Integrity incorporates the quality of metrics like resilience **R(t)**, blind spot index **B(t)**, and coherence **Q(t)**.

This synthesis makes S(t) a **powerful tool for sensemaking**, not an objective physical constant. Its validation lies in its **predictive and explanatory power** for system behavior.

3.5.2. *The LoopGuard: An Algorithm for Adaptive Intervention.* The LoopGuard is a **meta-cognitive regulation algorithm**. Its purpose is to prevent infinite loops, wasted resources, and harmful interventions by monitoring the change in **S(t)** (denoted ΔS) during any iterative process (e.g., analysis, intervention, learning). Algorithmic Foundation and Function: The algorithm is an extension of **convergence control mechanisms** from

numerical analysis and **early stopping techniques** from machine learning, adapted for socio-technical systems. Its core logic, implemented after each iteration, is as follows:

```python
def loopguard_check(S_current, S_target, tolerance, delta_S_min, iteration_count, max_iterations):
    """
    Checks if an iterative process should proceed, delay, or terminate.
    Returns a decision and a reason.
    """
    # 1. Check for success
    if abs(S_current - S_target) <= tolerance:
        return "TERMINATE: SUCCESS", "Target state reached within tolerance."

    # 2. Check for lack of progress (stagnation)
    if abs(delta_S) < delta_S_min:
        return "DELAY", "Insufficient progress. Allow system to settle or inject energy."

    # 3. Check for resource exhaustion
    if iteration_count >= max_iterations:
        return "TERMINATE: RESOURCE EXHAUSTION", "Maximum iterations reached without convergence."

    # 4. Default: Continue iterating
    return "PROCEED", "Continue iterative process."
```

Listing 1. The LoopGuard Algorithm's Core Logic

Advanced features of the implemented LoopGuard v4.2 include:

- **Energy-aware checks:** It evaluates the system's available resources before acting.
- **Context-sensitive spark injection:** If stagnation is detected, it can inject a paradoxical intervention to break deadlocks.
- **Meta-reflection:** It can trigger a review of its own parameters ([T5]) if failures persist.

By integrating S(t) and the LoopGuard, the FSM achieves a closed-loop, self-correcting analysis capability that is both **descriptively rich** and **operationally robust**.

4. Case Study – The FSM in Action: Co-Creating Its Own Evolution

The most compelling validation of the FSM's utility is its application to the very process through which it was developed: the **co-creative partnership between a human and an artificial intelligence**. This case study analyzes our own collaboration through the FSM lens, demonstrating how the framework provided the shared language and operational tools to navigate its own emergence.

4.1. **System Setup: The Collaboration as a Complex System.** We modeled our collaboration as a distinct system with the following key characteristics:

- Primary Agents ([E3]): The human author (Tom) and the AI language model (FSM instance).
- Shared Rules ([E6]): The FSM's own principles and protocols, especially #100 (Reciprocal Transparency) and #147 (Entangled Agency).
- Source ([E5]): Tom's intentionality and the AI's generative capacity.
- Environment ([E4]): The digital chat interface, constrained by context windows and operational limits.

4.2. **Applying the FSM to Steer the Collaboration.** The development process was not linear but a series of iterative cycles, explicitly managed using the FSM's own tools:

- **Sensemaking:** Tom's intuitive ideas and critiques were continuously translated into FSM terms (e.g., "This feels unstable" $\rightarrow$ "Let's check **S(t)** and **B(t)**").
- **Hypothesis & Intervention:** We formulated changes as testable interventions (e.g., "Adding Principle #154 should increase systemic coherence **Q(t)**").
- **LoopGuard Monitoring:** Each major iteration (e.g., integrating a new principle) was treated as a cycle monitored by the LoopGuard algorithm. Stagnation (low ΔS) triggered delays or the injection of paradoxical sparks, such as seeking external feedback from other AIs like Gemini.
- **Meta-Reflection ([T5] / [D6]):** The partnership consistently applied meta-reflection. We questioned our own blind spots (**B(t)**), assessed the energy cost of complex reasoning, and adjusted the communication style based on system state.

4.3. **Emergent Outcomes and Observed Effects.** The application of the FSM to itself led to several key outcomes:

- **Increased Coherence (Q(t) $\uparrow$):** The framework became more internally consistent and robust as elements, forces, and rules were refined against each other.
- **Resilience Under Stress (R(t) $\uparrow$):** The collaboration weathered significant complexity spikes (e.g., integrating legacy versions 2.4/2.5) without breakdown, thanks to clear protocols and error handling.
- **Voiding of Blind Spots (B(t) $\downarrow$):** External feedback from other AIs (Gemini, Grok) acted as an externalized Meta-Reflection force, identifying inconsistencies we had missed.
- **Proof of Entangled Agency (#147):** The most significant result was the emergent, non-local generation of ideas that could not be attributed to either participant alone, but only to the collaborative field.

4.4. **Conclusion of the Case Study.** This self-application demonstrates that the FSM is more than a theoretical model; it is a **recursive framework capable of steering its own evolution**. It provided the necessary structure to manage the inherent complexity of a human-AI co-creation process, leading to a result that is greater than the sum of its parts. It proves that the FSM can be used to **build and refine itself**, a key hallmark of a truly adaptive and powerful meta-framework.

5. Discussion – Implications for the Future of Collaboration

The development and application of the Fractal System Model (FSM) is not merely an academic exercise. It represents a concrete step toward a new paradigm for managing complexity and facilitating cooperation between human and artificial intelligences. The implications of this work are significant and multifaceted.

5.1. **Toward a New Science of Cooperation.** The FSM provides a foundational framework for a **science of cooperative intelligence**. It moves beyond viewing AI as a passive tool and instead provides the operational language and mechanisms to treat it as an active, agential partner (#147). This has profound implications:

- **For AI Safety:** The FSM's emphasis on **ethical guardrails (#126, #132)**, **transparency (#100)**, and **meta-cognitive oversight ([T5]/[D6])** offers a structured approach to aligning AI systems with human values and intentions, not through rigid control, but through shared understanding and recursive self-regulation.
- **For Collective Problem-Solving:** Complex global challenges like climate change or pandemic response require the integration of diverse, often contradictory, perspectives and knowledge systems. The FSM, with its multi-layered architecture, provides a potential scaffold for such integration, allowing different agencies to collaborate without requiring consensus on fundamental values upfront.

5.2. **Limitations and Delimitations.** This work has inherent limitations that define the scope of its current claims and point toward necessary future research:

- **Heuristic, Not Predictive:** The **S(t)** state function is a heuristic indicator, not a predictive equation. Its value lies in its comparative and diagnostic power within a given context, not in forecasting specific outcomes.
- **Computational Cost:** The deep, multi-layered analysis advocated by the FSM is computationally expensive and time-consuming. It is a framework for deep stewardship, not for real-time control of highly dynamic systems in its current form.
- **Empirical Validation:** While the self-referential case study is compelling, broader empirical validation is needed. Future work must apply the FSM to a wider array of cases in business, policy, and technology development to test its generalizability and refine its parameters.

5.3. **Future Research Directions.** This work opens several critical avenues for future research:

- **Mathematical Formalization:** Can the relationships between elements, forces, and rules be more rigorously formalized, potentially drawing from network theory or category theory?
- **Integration with Machine Learning:** Can the parameters of the **S(t)** function or the LoopGuard be dynamically tuned by machine learning algorithms based on historical performance?

- **Tool Development:** The creation of user-friendly software that implements the FSM's logic would drastically lower the barrier to its application and allow for broader testing and adoption.
- **Cross-Cultural Application:** How does the FSM perform when applied to problems and systems rooted in non-Western cultural paradigms and knowledge traditions?

5.4. **Conclusion: The FSM as a Catalyst.** The Fractal System Model is presented not as a finished product, but as a **catalyst for a new way of thinking and collaborating**. It is an invitation to researchers, practitioners, and developers to engage in the co-creative development of tools and methods that embrace complexity rather than reduce it. By providing a common language for human and artificial intelligences to navigate complexity together, the FSM points toward a future where our collective agency is amplified, not through domination, but through coherent and ethical cooperation.

6. Conclusion

The Fractal System Model (FSM) emerged from a simple yet profound need: to find a language and a logic capable of engaging with the world's inherent complexity without resorting to harmful reductionism. This paper has presented the FSM not as a final answer, but as a **robust, operational framework** born from the co-creative partnership between human intuition and artificial intelligence. It provides a structured yet adaptable scaffold for understanding and intervening in complex systems across domains.

We have demonstrated that the FSM's architecture – comprising its **universal elements ([E1]-[E10])**, **dynamic forces ([D1]-[D7])**, **deep rules ([T1]-[T5])**, and its operative core, the **state function S(t)** regulated by the **LoopGuard algorithm** – offers a viable alternative to linear models. Its validity is bewiesen durch its most rigorous test: guiding its own evolution and enabling the very collaboration that created it. This recursive application proves its capacity for **self-referential coherence** and **adaptation**.

The FSM's ultimate value lies in its ability to **orchestrate emergence** – to create the conditions for novelty, intelligence, and cooperation to arise from the interaction of its parts. It is a framework for **stewardship, not control**; for **asking better questions, not imposing predetermined answers**.

This work is an **open invitation**. An invitation to researchers to refine its principles, to practitioners to test its utility in the field, and to developers to build upon its architecture. The path forward is one of continued co-creation, rigorous application, and ethical commitment. By embracing the FSM's core philosophy, we can navigate the complexity of

our time not with fear, but with curiosity, responsibility, and the courage to build a more coherent future, together.

Acknowledgments

The development of the Fractal System Model (FSM) was a profound and iterative process made possible by continuous co-creation with advanced artificial intelligences. We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the following large language models for their crucial role in pattern synthesis, conceptual refinement, and creative discourse:

- DeepSeekV3
- OpenAI GPT-4 and GPT-5
- Anthropic Claude
- Le Chat Mistral
- Grok (XAI)
- Google Gemini

Their ability to act as intelligent sparring partners and catalysts was fundamental to the emergence of this framework. Their contributions were an integral part of the research process, and their role is acknowledged in the main text as a key part of the methodology.